

**WHAT WILL BE THE IMPACTS  
OF CONSOLIDATING TYPE I JAIL OPERATIONS  
FOR THE MEDIUM SIZED POLICE AGENCY  
BY THE YEAR 2006?**

**A project presented to  
California Commission on  
Police Officer Standards and Training**

**by**

**Captain James L. Weuve  
Cypress Police Department**

**Command College Class XXX**

**Sacramento, California  
June 2001**

This Command College Project is a FUTURES study of a particular emerging issue in law enforcement. Its purpose is NOT to predict the future, but rather to project a number of possible scenarios for strategic planning consideration.

Defining the future differs from analyzing the past because the future has not yet happened. In this project, useful alternatives have been formulated systematically so that the planner can respond to a range of possible future environments.

Managing the future means influencing the future; creating it, constraining it, adapting to it. A futures study points the way.

The view and conclusions expressed in this Command College project are those of the author and not necessarily those of the Commission on Police Officer Standards and Training.  
(POST)

©Copyright 2003

California Commission on Police Officer

## Standards and Training

### TABLE OF CONTENTS

SECTION ONE: BACKGROUND DEVELOPMENT OF THE ISSUE	1
Introduction	1
State of California Situation	4
Local Department – City Jail Profiles	6
Traditional Alternatives	10
Case for Consolidation	13
SECTION TWO: FUTURES STUDY	17
Nominal Group Technique	17
Trends	17
Events	25
Cross Impact Analysis	31
Future Scenarios	33
Pessimistic	33
Optimistic	35
Normative	37
SECTION THREE: A STRATEGY FOR THE FUTURE	42
The Current Environment	42
SWOT Analysis	43
Stakeholder Analysis	45
Strategy Development	49
SECTION FOUR: TRANSITION MANAGEMENT	50
Stakeholders	50
Transition Plan	51

Transition Management Structure	54
SECTION FIVE: CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	56
APPENDICES	61
Appendix A – Nominal Group Technique Panel	61
Appendix B – NGT: Trends Brainstorming List	62
Appendix C – NGT: Events Brainstorming List	64
ENDNOTES	66
BIBLIOGRAPHY	68

## LIST OF TABLES

Tables		Page
1	Average Number of Persons Booked Per Month	4
2	Average Daily Population (ADP)	4
3	Trends Analysis Table – Median	18
4	Event Summary Table – Median	26
5	Cross Impact Analysis	32

## SECTION ONE

### DEVELOPMENT OF THE ISSUE

#### Introduction

The purpose of this project is to research and study the possible impacts of consolidating Type I jail operations by medium sized police agencies by the year 2006. The concept is based on the fact that jail facilities are necessities to municipal police agencies and they are becoming increasingly expensive to operate and maintain. Police executives are being pressed by city managers and political leadership to “do more with less and to do it faster, better and cheaper.”<sup>1</sup> Therefore, all aspects of a police department’s operation must be carefully examined in terms of efficiency and effectiveness regarding the overall service levels being provided to the local community. One of those essentials is the jail operation. Although not readily identified by most citizens and politicians within the community as a service level commodity, the jail function, nonetheless, is a vital part of the police department’s mission.

For some medium sized police agencies, there may be the need for self-examination in regards to their jail operation, if they even have one. The factors for consideration are numerous. The most prominent is funding. Can the agency financially support a stand-alone operation? In other words, can the department operate and maintain its own city jail? The significant costs associated with stand-alone operations relate to staffing and facility needs. Another aspect that could influence the need or desire to operate a jail is the availability of a county jail or alternative jail facility within a reasonable distance from the department. If such facilities are not readily accessible, then alternatives may need to be sought. If the facilities are accessible, are there any

fees or costs attached to their use? Lastly, what are the projected needs for a Type I jail facility based on forecast crime trends?

The approach for this project is to first examine briefly the current status of jails throughout the State of California. For the sake of this discussion, the jails referred to herein, will include Types II, III, and IV. These jail facilities are local detention facilities used to house pre-arraignment inmates, convicted, and sentenced inmates, and persons who are permitted access into the community respectfully. The circumstances affecting these facilities have a direct correlation with and impact on Type I jail facilities. The data that will be examined includes the average number of inmate bookings per month and the average daily population. A narrative summation of the *Jail Profile Survey 1999*, from the California Board of Corrections will detail the forecast trends relating to jails throughout the state. The statistics will show a paradox that even though crime rates are going down, the number of inmates being booked and housed is still exceeding the available bed space.

After reviewing the statewide perspective, a more detailed inspection of a local circumstance will be presented. In this case, the police departments for the cities of Cypress, Los Alamitos and Seal Beach, located on the west-end of Orange County, California, will be used as the basis for the model police departments of York, Cheshire and Dresden respectfully that will be referenced later in this paper. Although the needs for each department are similar, the approach and means of fulfilling those needs are diversely different. There are available to police executives and decision makers several options in respect to type and forms of jail operations, i.e., stand alone, public outsource, and privatization. These will be discussed in terms of proponent and opponent arguments. The intent of this paper is to propose a possible alternative option that heretofore has not been employed.

Through literature review and interviews with subject matter experts, a plausible foundation will be established to begin the discussions. A process, known as a Nominal Group Technique (NGT), was conducted for the purpose of examining and forecasting future trends and events that could have some impact on the subject matter of this project. Based on the NGT panels discussions, three scenarios will be presented that reflect possible future outcomes in respect to consolidation efforts of Type I jail operations.

A strategic plan will be presented that includes Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities, and Threats (SWOT) analysis. Included in the strategic plan will be stakeholder analysis and recommendations for implementation strategies. Strategic planning is a process used to identify long-term goals to meet the future needs of the organization(s). For purposes of this project, the strategic plan will pursue the steps necessary to move three organizations into a consolidated effort for jail operations.

Based on the developed strategies, a transition management plan, with leadership implications, will be offered for purposes of implementation. The project concludes with a summary of the findings and recommendations.

Before addressing the issue of jail operations from a local perspective, there needs to be some discussion regarding the state's current status in respect to the number of inmates being booked each month and the average daily population. This data is important because it not only reflects the trends and conditions of the state's larger jail systems, but as will be shown, it also has a direct impact on the jail operations for the medium sized police agency.



### State Of California Situation

An examination of the statistics from the California Board of Corrections, *Jail Profile Survey 1999*, will provide some foundation to this discussion. The survey collects data relating to jail operations from California's fifty-eight counties, sixty-three local jail jurisdictions, and one hundred and thirty six local jail facilities. It should be noted that the jail capacity represented by the surveyed jails totals about 72,000 beds.<sup>2</sup> The Board of Corrections uses this data as a means of identifying trends involving the state's jail system. Although there are several categories and classifications that are collected from the survey, the two being considered for this paper are Average Number of Persons Booked per Month, and Average Daily Population. The following tables provide this data for a five-year period of time 1994-1998.

Table 1

#### Average Number of Persons Booked Per Month

<b>5 Year Summary</b>				
<b>1994</b>	<b>1995</b>	<b>1996</b>	<b>1997</b>	<b>1998</b>
103,998	97,589	101,939	99,180	98,915

Table2

#### Average Daily Populations (ADP)

<b>5 Year Summary</b>				
<b>1994</b>	<b>1995</b>	<b>1996</b>	<b>1997</b>	<b>1998</b>
69,233	71,107	72,029	76,906	79,149

The data reflects that the number of bookings per month over the five-year period has fluctuated, even though crime rates have steadily decreased throughout the state during the same time period.<sup>3</sup> More notable is the finding that regardless of the number of bookings per month, the number of inmates housed in the state's jails far exceeded the available bed space. It is evident that the Average Daily Population increased each succeeding year since 1994.

Based on the perspective presented by the Board of Corrections, the following observations serve notice that current jail conditions are not going to improve without some proactive approach.

"... as the California population increases, there will be increased pressure on the jail system. The mechanisms for reducing this pressure (un-served warrants, pretrial releases, early releases of sentenced inmates, inmates housed in other jurisdictions under contract, alternative-to-incarceration programs) can go only so far. As the pressure increases we get closer and closer to failing to incarcerate, or releasing early, offenders who represent a threat to public safety. In addition, we will compromise the deterrent value associated with incarceration."<sup>4</sup>

It is further suggested:

"...if there is not a substantial building program initiated in the future, and assuming that the inmate population is restricted to 80,000 inmates due to court-ordered population caps, jail standards, and humanitarian reasons, we will no longer be incarcerating those who should be incarcerated. Rather, we will have to develop some means of accurately identifying the 80,000 most dangerous offenders and taking our chances with the rest."<sup>5</sup>

To illustrate how one factor could have a significant impact on the jail population throughout the state, there are currently 2.1 million un-served misdemeanor warrants, and 243 thousand un-served felony warrants in California. If these warrants were all served within a short period of time, and just a small portion of them resulted in a person going to jail, the jail population would double.<sup>6</sup> Based on the data presented above, there is no room for these additional inmates.

To summarize, crime rates throughout the state are declining and it would be speculative at best to say that the trend would continue for any length of time in the future. The average number of inmate bookings per month has remained relatively constant over a five-year period of time. The average daily population in the jails throughout the state has increased during the same time period. This overcrowding condition is projected to worsen unless there are some substantial jail construction efforts initiated soon. It is reasonable to expect that should these facilities face a crisis situation, there will be serious consequences for local law enforcement agencies that rely on these jails as either primary or even secondary booking sites. The effects could simply be stated that there is no room at the inn.

#### Local Department- City Jail Profiles

For medium sized police agencies like the Cypress, Los Alamitos, and Seal Beach Police Departments the need for a Type I jail operation certainly exists, yet the funding to properly operate and maintain such a facility does not. A case in point, a Police Services Study was commissioned in 1998, regarding the operations of the Cypress Police Department. One of the conclusions articulated in that Study was that the number one priority for the police department to address, from a liability position, was their Type I jail operation<sup>7</sup>. This was due in large part to the lack of staffing for the jail. Remarkably at the time, there were only two full-time personnel assigned to the twenty-four hour, seven day a week, 365 day a year, Type I jail operation. Staffing comprises at least eighty percent or more of the cost of operating a detention facility.<sup>8</sup> Because of this factor, any increases to the number of personnel, whether sworn or civilian, will have some significant impact on the budget. The Cypress Police Department in 1999 made the decision to down grade their Type I jail operation to a Temporary Holding facility

for detention of inmates up to twenty-four hours only. This decision was made based on the costs required to maintain a Type I jail operation.

To begin this discussion there needs to be a clear understanding of the term Type I jail. Therefore, by definition, a Type I jail facility means a local detention facility used for the detention of persons usually pending arraignment for not more than ninety-six hours, excluding holidays and weekends after booking. Such a Type I facility may also detain persons on court order either for their own safekeeping or sentenced to a city jail as an inmate worker, and may house inmate workers sentenced to the county jail provided such placement in the facility is made on a voluntary basis on the part of the inmate.<sup>9</sup>

The following brief descriptions of the three police departments and their respective jail operations will serve as the foundation for future discussions.

The city of Cypress was incorporated in 1956, and is a community consisting of approximately seven square miles in area. The population is estimated to be approximately fifty thousand persons with the majority of the demographic composition being Caucasians (79.2 percent), Asians (13.7 percent), and Hispanics (11.5 percent). The median household income is \$50,981.00.

The Cypress Police Department has fifty-six sworn officer positions and eighteen full time civilian positions. The jail is staffed with five full time police services officers who are supervised by a sergeant and lieutenant. The jail capacity is eight beds. The average number of bookings, per year is 1800. The 1999/2000 police budget was \$8.3 million.<sup>10</sup>

The city of Los Alamitos was incorporated in 1960, and consists of approximately four square miles in which about half is occupied by the Armed Forces Training Base, Los Alamitos. The population is estimated to be approximately 11,676 persons with the majority of the

demographics being Caucasians (84.9 percent) and Hispanic (12.5 percent). The median household income is \$45,171.00.

The Los Alamitos Police Department has twenty-five sworn officers, three full time civilian employees, three reserve officer positions, and six part-time civilian employees. There are approximately three hundred arrests made per year. The Los Alamitos jail is not staffed. Inmates are merely detained in a holding facility until such time that they can be released or transported from the station. In no instance, however, may an inmate be left in confinement for more than twenty-four hours. The 1999/2000 police budget was \$ 3.5 million. The Los Alamitos Police Department does not currently operate a Type I jail facility primarily because of costs.<sup>11</sup>

The city of Seal Beach was incorporated in 1915, and consists of 10.72 square miles of land and 7.48 square miles of wetlands for a total of eighteen square miles in area. The population is approximately 25,098 persons and is comprised of two major demographic groups, Caucasians (93.7 percent) and Hispanics (5 percent). The median household income is \$32,834.00.

The Seal Beach Police Department is authorized thirty-seven sworn officers, eight full time civilian employees, ten reserve officers, and approximately forty volunteers. The Seal Beach jail is a thirty-bed facility. The operation of the Seal Beach jail facility is contracted to a private vendor, Corrections Systems, Inc. (CSI). The facility is staffed entirely of private citizen employees. The types of inmates range from local arrestees to federally sentenced inmates. The 1999/2000 police budget was approximately \$4.97 million. The Seal Beach Police Department could not operate a stand-alone Type I jail operation due to the associated costs. In fact, if the

police department were to lose the contract with Corrections Systems, Inc., there would be a significant loss of over \$120,000.00 a year in contract revenues to the city.<sup>12</sup>

For those medium sized agencies who currently operate a fully functional Type I jail facility, the reality is that costs are increasing as are the duties, tasks, responsibilities and liabilities to successfully operate such a facility. Pursuant to Title 15, California Code of Regulations (CCR), specific requirements are articulated that translate directly into costs to maintain a legally operating jail facility. A few examples include types and frequency of training for personnel, medical/mental services requirements, fire/life safety, facility design, and maintenance, and supplies related to feeding, clothing, bedding, and hygiene needs. Another financial concern is the cost of liability insurance for the jail and its operation. It is becoming more difficult to meet these demands from both a personnel and financial resource perspective. Continued operation of these jail facilities in a status quo condition will mean that police departments will face reduced funding for additional personnel needs, equipment purchases, and other worthwhile programs. This was exemplified by the action taken in 1999, by the Cypress Police Department with the downgrading of the Type I jail operation to a Temporary Holding facility operation due primarily to costs.

For those small to medium sized police agencies that do not operate a Type I jail facility, there still is a need for access to such a facility. When certain types of arrests are made, the inmate must be booked and detained until arraignment. Depending upon the distance to the county jail and/or alternative jail site, time becomes a commodity. The time an officer spends transporting and processing an inmate at an off- site location is time not spent in the field for patrol related activities. Or in the case of some agencies with temporary holding facilities, the officer may find him or herself standing by in the jail area for hours at a time, waiting to release

an inmate from custody. In both examples, there is a cost factor in terms of soft dollars being spent for support activities by front line personnel.

### Traditional Alternatives

The question begs asking then, if a Type I jail operation is desired or needed, and due to costs is unaffordable, what are the alternative options? The first is to book all inmates that may be detained for longer than twenty-four hours into the county jail. As was illustrated earlier in this paper, those facilities throughout the state are in an overcrowded condition and arguably may not be as accessible for all types of bookings in the future. If that choice is not practical, there are two other options that are currently employed in the State of California; they are public contracting or outsourcing, and private contracting or privatization. At the time of this writing, there are ninety-four Type I jail facilities operated by municipal police agencies in the State of California. Of those, Baldwin Park, Irvine, Montebello, San Bernardino, San Diego, Seal Beach and Garden Grove are contracted to private vendors by municipal police agencies.<sup>13</sup>

There is much debate regarding both the merits and the shortfalls of the two contracting options. The arguments in favor of and those against contracting jail services are similar for both public outsourcing and privatization. In most cases, when mention is made to contracting jail or prison services, the reference is being made in regards to privatization. A leading proponent of prison privatization is Charles H. Logan, Ph.D., Professor of Sociology at the University of Connecticut. He has written extensively on the subject and has created a list of arguments for and against privatization. Although the list was established in respect to prisons, the stated arguments below are relevant to the discussion for Type I jails. For purposes of this project, the listed items pertain to both public outsourcing and to private contracting, unless indicated as privatization only.

Some of the more persuasive arguments for contracting are as follows:<sup>14</sup>

- Contracting across jurisdictions permits economies of scale.
- Contracting may reduce overly generous public employee pensions and benefits.  
(privatization)
- Contracting counteracts the motivation of budget-based government agencies to continually grow in size and to maximize their budgets.
- Contracting avoids cumbersome and rigid government procurement procedures; vendors can purchase more quickly, maintain lower inventories, and negotiate better prices and values. (privatization)

Some of the more persuasive arguments against contracts are as follows:<sup>15</sup>

- Contracting for imprisonment involves an improper delegation to private hands of coercive power and authority. (privatization)
- Contracting jails raises legal questions about the potential use of deadly force.  
(privatization)
- Contracting may cost more in the long run as a result of “low-balling” the initial bids followed by unjustifiable price increases in subsequent contracts.
- Contracting will not allow the government to escape liability. (privatization)
- Contracting may limit flexibility by the vendor refusing to go beyond the terms of the contract without renegotiation.

One of the foremost concerns regarding private firms or companies contracting for jail services in the State of California is that “there is no statutory authority for public entities such as cities or counties to delegate public officer or peace officer powers to privately employed jail staff pursuant to Penal Code 830 et seq. Civilian jail staff employed by private firms cannot



perform certain duties such as: necessary use of force (chemical agents, lethal and less than lethal weaponry); search, seizure and arrest; accessing confidential records; among others”.<sup>16</sup> This is certainly a major issue that must be considered prior to contracting with a private vendor. From a legal position, the question needs to be asked, do civilians have legal protections of qualified immunity from certain lawsuits, as would public employees? Until there is some definitive resolution to this issue either by legislation or litigation, there will be uncertainty regarding the legality of privatization of jail services in California.

Another alternative to the stand-alone model is by contracting for jail services from another agency. Again, this concept has not gained favor with any significant number of agencies throughout the state. Public outsourcing, however, does not fall victim to the same concerns regarding public employee versus private civilian employee matters. There are, nevertheless, a couple of concerns that are directly related to public contracting. One of those is liability. In this case, the entity providing the service assumes a greater exposure to liability. With increased numbers of inmates comes increased potential for incidents resulting in lawsuits. Although the costs for this exposure may be passed along in the costs for the contract, the settlement for a sizable judgment may not. The second concern is less tangible and applies largely to those agencies that have or have had a Type I jail facility. That fear is that the contracted department is being broken up piecemeal. Regardless of the logic behind the move, there will be those who worry that no element or unit within the organization is safe. It comes down to the fear of change.<sup>17</sup>

Typically, the option of public outsourcing has been used more by the medium to large sized police agencies than with the smaller jurisdictions. For the low end user of jail facilities, it is more practical to use another agency's facilities than to bear the burden of maintaining their

own. This may be measured in terms of personnel and operational costs versus overall usage on an annual basis. Depending upon the terms and language of the contract, this option can offer some benefits to both parties of the agreement. The most prominent benefit with this choice is cost reduction for both parties. In simple terms, both agencies share costs for the operation of one jail facility. The down side to such arrangements includes loss of management control by the contracting agency and increased liability exposure by the contractor agency. As stated earlier, the perception seems to be that one agency is giving itself away piecemeal to its neighbor.

Summarizing then, we can assume that most police agencies have a need for a Type I jail facility, either in conjunction with or in exclusion of county jail facilities. Forecast conditions relating to the operation of such facilities i.e., costs, overcrowding of county facilities, etc., will encourage police administrators to examine alternative options to their own stand-alone model. If traditional alternatives do not meet or satisfy the needs of those police administrators, then what options are foreseeable? It is suggested that consideration be given to consolidation efforts.

#### Case For Consolidation

According to the *Webster's II New College Dictionary*, the term to *consolidate* means "To unite into one system or body"<sup>18</sup>. The concept of consolidation is not new to law enforcement. Examples include the consolidation of dispatch services among police and fire agencies. The theory being, that through economy of scale, there will be cost savings to the stakeholders. If the consolidation is formed correctly, there should be only limited loss of control by any of the participating parties and there should be no decrease or derogation in service levels.

There is relatively little literature available on the subject matter of consolidating jail operations. One of the few exceptions is a document titled, *Briefing Paper: Regional Jails* that was published in January of 1992, by the National Institute of Corrections Information Center. The definition of consolidated jails presented in this document was “multi-jurisdictional detention facilities in which two or more jurisdictions share in both the initial capital construction and ongoing operating costs. Representatives of the jurisdictions jointly organize, administer, operate, and finance the facilities through an annual budget. Currently in the State of California, there are no consolidated adult jail operations in existence.”<sup>19</sup>

As was presented in the discussions relating to contracting jail services, there are advantages and disadvantages to this format of jail operations as well. The chief obstacles to successful implementation of a consolidated jail effort are political rather than technical. Some barriers include:

- Absence of legal authority to permit the sharing of resources across jurisdictional lines.
- Differences in management philosophy.
- Perceived inequities in proportionate sharing of costs.
- Lack of cooperation from judicial authorities.
- Disagreement over the location of the jail.
- “Turf issues,” the loss of authority and control by the police chief and city governing bodies.

Some of the advantages to consolidating jail operations include:

- Costs are shared proportionately with participating members.
- Cities with limited resources have access to better and more modern facilities.

- Staff is professional, and advanced management practices are used.
- Consolidated jail operations have greater access to community resources.
- There is an economy of scale regarding staffing needs.
- Police chief and city governing bodies still have some authority and control regarding the operation of the jail, although reduced from a stand-alone.

By examining the two lists carefully, it will be apparent that some of the advantages are also listed disadvantages. Depending upon how the Joint Powers Authority and the governance structures are established, there can be bi-polar results. The advantages outweigh the negatives, when given the choice between expensive stand-alone jail operations versus a joint venture enterprise.<sup>20</sup>

One of the concerns often expressed in discussions regarding consolidation is that with the very effort to do more with less, the consolidation effort through a Joint Powers Agreement creates a whole new bureaucracy. The creation of a new governmental entity is often times the by-product of a Joint Powers Agreement. Most traditional Joint Powers Authorities are created with the formation of a new agency. This new agency, like any other, requires policy makers, management oversight, supervision, and a work force. It additionally requires a budget, documented policies and procedures, personnel rules and regulations, a payroll system, legal counsel, insurance, etc., all of those things that are found within each and every police agency. Depending upon the manner in which a Joint Powers Agreement is structured, this alternative could be more expensive and uncontrollable than which is currently in place. The means to success is by combining existing resources without constructing new organizational layers. Through cooperative partnerships and creative insights towards governance configurations, the horrors of conventional Joint Powers Agreements do not have to come to fruition.

Workable systems do exist today. As project manager for the West Cities Communications Center Joint Powers Authority project, or hereinafter referred to as West-Comm, the author had first hand knowledge and experience in creating and implementing a Joint Powers Authority that produced both a limited bureaucracy and a scheme for significant cost savings to the participating partnership. West-Comm is a consolidated communications center in which the dispatch function for the cities of Cypress, Los Alamitos, and Seal Beach were united into one body. The communications center began operations in September of 1997 and has been successfully operating since.

Although the concept of consolidation is not new to law enforcement, the hypothesis has not been seriously considered for such functions as jail operations. It would appear from the state statistics that jail overcrowding is going to continue to be an issue into the future. The needs of medium sized police agencies for Type I jail facilities will also continue to exist. If there are legal issues involving the privatization of jail services and if there are liability concerns related to public outsourcing of jail services, an alternative could be consolidation. As will be demonstrated next, there are a multitude of potential trends and events that could impact the practicality and necessity of a consolidation effort.

## SECTION TWO

### FUTURES STUDY

#### Nominal Group Technique

In Section One, a case was made to examine further the concept of consolidating Type I jail operations. This section will pursue some analysis regarding possible trends and events that may have some bearing or impact on those consolidation efforts. The method used for this project was the Nominal Group Technique (NGT). This process seeks to identify various trends and events from a panel comprised of knowledgeable individuals who have expertise in a variety of fields. Once the trends and events have been identified and discussed, they are analyzed in terms of the potential influence that they may have on the future outcomes for this issue.

The NGT panel for this project consisted of one city councilman, one city manager, one police chief, one assistant to the city manager, one police lieutenant, one sergeant from the sheriff's department, one college professor in economics, one real estate broker, and one field representative from the California Board of Corrections. In addition to the participating panelists, a police captain and a police department secretary assisted with the facilitation of the NGT. The names and specific job assignments are listed in the Appendix A of this report.

#### Trends

A trend is defined as a series of occurrences, that when viewed together, will likely indicate a tendency towards a particular course or movement in a certain direction. A trend may be qualitative as well as quantitative and its past does not necessarily have to be a predictor of the future. Through a facilitated process, the group was asked to brainstorm and to develop a list of trends that could have some impact or influence on the consolidation efforts of Type I jail operations. The group developed a list of thirty trends (Appendix B).

Once the list was crafted; the panel had the opportunity to discuss each trend, in respect to its perceived importance to the issue at hand. The group then selected 10 trends that they collectively believed would have the most effect on the consolidation efforts of a Type I jail operation. The current status of each trend was given an arbitrary value of 100 and was used as the reference point. Each panelist then provided their own opinion on the direction and magnitude of each trend in respect to its professed value five years prior, plus five years in the future, plus ten years in the future and the impact or concern that each trend would have on the issue of consolidation. The trend summary and table, the top ten trends and the relevant discussion follow:

Table 3

Trends Analysis Table - Median

	<b>-5 years</b>	<b>Today</b>	<b>+5 Years</b>	<b>+10 Years</b>	<b>Concern 1-10</b>
<b>Trend 1</b>	96	100	116	156	5.8
<b>Trend 2</b>	84	100	131	186	8.1
<b>Trend 3</b>	91	100	124	156	5.2
<b>Trend 4</b>	79	100	126	170	5.7
<b>Trend 5</b>	52	100	166	244	8.9
<b>Trend 6</b>	103	100	167	234	9.4
<b>Trend 7</b>	101	100	141	181	8.2
<b>Trend 8</b>	72	100	145	203	5.7
<b>Trend 9</b>	90	100	159	233	8.8
<b>Trend 10</b>	77	100	153	215	7.8

## Trend 1 - Cost of Officers in Relation to Booking and Transportation

For purposes of discussion, the assumption is made that personnel costs represent approximately eighty percent of most municipal government budgets. With downsizing of departments and the philosophy of doing more with less, the importance of the officer's time in the field cannot be over emphasized. This is particularly true for most medium sized police agencies that do not have the sworn officer resources to allocate to a variety of special assignments or details. Staffing levels in the field generally are at or near minimum levels. It is therefore critical to most police operations to keep the patrol officers as unencumbered and in the field as much as possible.

The costs associated with field operations are directly related to the tasks and responsibilities of the patrol officer. When the officer is assigned non-patrol or non-field work, the costs for enforcement actions, community oriented policing or crime prevention activities goes up proportionally. An example relating to this project is that a patrol officer is expected to spend as much time as possible in the field. There is a loss of time and money associated with him/her being pulled out of the field to spend time with booking and/or transporting an inmate to an off-site county jail. The panel expressed the belief that patrol officers need to maximize the amount the time available for field operations, not support activities.

## Trend 2 – Cultural Diversity

In California, the changing demographics and cultural diversity are changing in vast proportions. We have seen an increasing influx of Asian, Hispanic, African-American, Russian, Arabic, and Pacific-Rim populations. With this diversity comes a multitude of attitudes and beliefs regarding governmental authority, rules and regulations and laws. Customs from one culture clash with the customs and ceremonies of another. From the panel's perspective, there



was a universal feeling that today's society, in general, displays a greater lack of respect towards their fellow man than ever before. As a result, there appears to be a greater tendency towards unprovoked rage and violence on innocent or non-participative parties.

Additionally there is expected to be a dramatic increase in the number of teenagers in the sixteen to nineteen year old age-bracket within the next five years. With that increase, there can be expected to be a high probability of violent crime increasing. This in-conjunction with the increases of violence and criminal activity related to the changing cultural make-up of our communities, which will have a direct impact on the delivery of police services in the future.

### Trend 3 – Community Attitudes developed through Media Scrutiny

Public opinion certainly cannot be overlooked as a decisive force in formulating public policy. Without sounding elementary, elected officials generally must be responsive to their constituents or face being replaced at the next election. Much of today's public opinion is generated from the vast array of media coverage that is available. It seems that on any given issue, controversy can be generated depending upon the slant given to it by media coverage.

It was the consensus of the panel that public attitudes towards local jails would be consistent with the attitudes they held for the police department as a whole. In other words, the public likely would not be able to differentiate the difference between the operation of a municipal jail facility and the operation of the police department. Therefore, if a local jail was receiving poor press and had a less than desirable reputation, then the police department would also have a poor reputation within the community. In most instances, the press would be the conduit that would formulate any public opinion regarding a municipal jail. Whatever perspective the coverage took, the resulting image would most likely mirror the slant presented to the public. The panel believed that the media's slant towards the police department would not

in itself be overpowering; it could however, in combination with other factors have an effect on consolidation efforts.

#### Trend 4 – Construction Costs

The costs related to construction have consistently been on the rise for the last two decades. It was the opinion of the panel that these costs would continue to increase. Consideration was given to the fact that the economy is healthy and unemployment is low. The fact remains that land/real estate prices have begun to increase again after the lull in the early and mid-nineties and the costs associated with new construction will at least parallel those increase rates. Although construction costs are generally considered as one-time costs, versus recurring costs, i.e., personnel costs, they can be very extensive depending upon the size and complexity of the project.

#### Trend 5 – Regionalization of Government Services

Regionalization or consolidation of governmental services is a practical means of providing services by two or more entities through the design of economy of scales. The hypothesis for consolidation or regionalization is that the same service can be provided at the same level, by reducing costs through limiting the duplication of personnel and/or equipment needed to perform or supply said service.

Historically, most municipal entities have only considered regionalization or consolidation of governmental functions when there was a pending financial crisis. Successful examples exist that illustrate the fact that by consolidating certain functions, costs can be reduced, service levels can be maintained and the municipalities do not relinquish control as the service provider. It is believed that factors other than economic ones may also have an impact or

influence on the future desire to consolidate certain governmental functions/services. The panel placed high value on this trend in respect to the degree of acceptance towards consolidation efforts relating to jail functions.

#### Trend 6 – Judicial Mandates

The business of government is largely based on statutes and legislative regulations. Very often however, the judiciary offers a ruling or mandate that can have profound impacts on the operation(s) of governmental entities. When this occurs, the results usually have both operational and financial implications that must be addressed. When government agencies demonstrate illegal, unethical, or questionable operational practices, the courts have not hesitated to issue mandates that can affect just one agency or all like agencies within a region or the nation.

An example relating to this project is a situation that occurred in the mid-nineteen nineties in Orange County, California. The sheriff at the time was under a Federal Court order to limit the number of inmates that were being held in county jail facilities. The order was the result of jail overcrowding. At the same time, an Orange County superior court judge issued a court order prohibiting the sheriff from giving early releases to inmates that had been sentenced to county jail for crimes in which they had been convicted of in Superior Court. For the sheriff, the penalty in both instances for non-compliance was contempt of court with the real threat of being sentenced to jail. Obviously, judicial mandates can have a powerful impact on the operation of a governmental agency and its day-to-day operation. Based on this, and similar incidents, the panel believed that judicial mandates would greatly impact this issue.

## Trend 7 – Need for Revenue Generation by Government

Funding is an integral component to any discussion for an organization that is involved in operational decision-making or futures planning. Municipalities may have to consider alternative revenue sources, if there is a significant reduction in sales tax and/or property tax dollars. The panel expressed the opinion that innovative revenue-generating methods will need to be explored for the purpose of supplementing tax dollar reductions.

The panel voiced concern that although the nation is currently experiencing a healthy economy, many local governments are facing rising expenditures in conjunction with a reduction in revenues. Such circumstances would eventually lead to expenditures exceeding revenues. Should this situation occur, service delivery would certainly be impacted. Depending upon the degree and severity of the deficits, non-essential services could be influenced minimally or to the extreme, they could be eliminated all together. Essential services would have to be examined closely to determine cost effectiveness. Any changes or modifications that could be implemented would most likely have to be made.

## Trend 8 – Use of Technology as Alternatives to Incarceration

The development of technology in the field of detention and corrections has progressed at a rapid rate. Surveillance equipment has improved in both quality and capability. With microchip technology, implants can now be attached to individuals, who then in turn can be tracked or located through Global Positioning Satellite resources within feet of their exact locations. These types of devices are currently in use for sentenced inmates and provide an alternative to being sentenced to a jail facility.

The panel's opinion was that this technology might eventually have some significant impact on Type I jail operations. It was discussed that this technology could be used for pre-

arraigned inmates by restricting them to their places of residence with an attached microchip device, until the time of their arraignment. The most noteworthy result would be probability of reduced jail populations. This in turn would result in the reduction of resources needed to staff and fund jails.

#### Trend 9 – Gap between Revenues and Costs of Local Government

For most municipalities, the local economy has the greatest impact on the ability to fund services. Regardless of the status of the national economy, local government relies on its own local tax base. For many small to medium sized cities, the local economy may hinge solely on one or two critical industries or businesses. The loss of one or two of these revenue generators could mean financial disaster for the entire community.

Additionally, it is generally accepted that with a poor economy, the demand for services rises, as does the crime rate. This imposes greater burdens on local government, more specifically police agencies, to provide and fund programs and services. The panel believed strongly that a driving force for any consideration regarding consolidation, regionalization, or contracting of services would be directly related to the state or condition of the local economy.

#### Trend 10 – Success of Community Oriented Policing Approaches

In recent years, the economy has been healthy; unemployment and crime rates are both down. Regardless of the reasons, the fact remains that these conditions are being experienced throughout most of the nation. Society in general has focused more on quality of life issues rather than crime problems. Potholes in the streets are just as likely to be a dominant issue being faced by a city council as any crime matter. Resources are going to be reallocated to other city departments when crime is viewed as secondary to these other concerns.

The panel viewed this matter as one in which priorities for local law enforcement will need to be reevaluated. If Community Oriented Policing (COP) and Problem Oriented Policing (POP) philosophies become more prevalent, it is believed that alternative solutions to resolving problems will be employed rather than mere incarceration. The validity of these thoughts by the panel are not necessarily accurate, however it clearly reflects the beliefs of many, both inside and outside law enforcement, in regards to what is COP and POP. If the perception is that with COP and POP programs, quality of life and crime matters are resolved through means other than making arrests, then funding for resources relating to jails could and would most likely be affected.

### Events

An event is defined as a one time or singular occurrence. For purposes of this exercise, the panel once again participated in a brainstorming session and developed a list of events (Appendix C). As with trends, the list of events was reviewed and discussed by the panel. Following the discussion, the panel selected nine events that they thought had the most potential to influence or impact the issue of consolidating jail operations. The panel was then instructed to forecast, in terms of years, when they believed a particular event would occur. The reference point was the date of the NGT. In other words, if a panelist indicated one year, they were stating that the event would occur from the date of the NGT to one year from that date. If they indicated three years, they were forecasting that the event would occur from sometime between the date of the NGT and three years from that date. The panel was then asked to assign a percentage figure to the probability of each event occurring within a specific time range in the future; for example, plus five years and plus ten years. Lastly, the panel assessed a value, either positive or negative, in regards to the impact that the event would have on this issue.

The mean scores relating to the forecasted events were summarized in a table. The event summary table and relevant discussion are as follows:

Table 4

Event Summary Table - Median

	<b>Years &gt; 0</b>	<b>+5 Years</b>	<b>+10 Years</b>	<b>Impact -10 to +10</b>
<b>Event 1</b>	2	75	95	+4
<b>Event 2</b>	3	25	100	+8
<b>Event 3</b>	3	75	100	+3
<b>Event 4</b>	3	50	100	+7
<b>Event 5</b>	5	25	50	+5
<b>Event 6</b>	5	40	75	+10
<b>Event 7</b>	5	10	20	-4
<b>Event 8</b>	2	90	100	+4
<b>Event 9</b>	3	30	75	+4

#### Event 1 – Election / Change of Leadership

With any election, the prospect of a change in leadership exists. The panel discussed this issue from the premise that the change in leadership for this NGT would involve city council members. The determination was made that any decision to consolidate services would most likely be made by city council members not by national, state or county officials.

Based on that premise, it was acknowledged that with new council members come new viewpoints and perspectives relating to community needs and priorities. These viewpoints may

or may not be supportive of public safety issues. The impacts of such a change are too numerous to list. The panel summarized their discussions with the position that in most instances, a city council would attempt to provide what is in the best interest of their community. Any decisions made regarding public safety would most likely reflect the attitudes and feelings of the community at large for fear by the council members of not being re-elected. The panel believed that this event would have only a moderate impact on this issue.

#### Event 2 – Re-institute / Increase Booking Fees

Currently, every county in the State of California with the exception of Orange County, require some form of booking fees by municipal agencies when booking an inmate into their respective county jail. The fees vary in the amount from one county to another, but were \$157.00 per inmate in Orange County until January 1, 1998. The booking fees were suspended by the then Sheriff, Brad Gates.

Aside from the obvious financial impacts associated with booking fees, there are some other consequences that have some disquieting impacts on public safety. It was the concern of the panel that with increases or re-institution in booking fees, there would be some reluctance to book inmates into county jail unless absolutely necessary. The expressed concern was that police departments, in an effort to avoid or minimize these costs, would find alternatives to incarceration such as a citation release, own recognizance release, or seek a complaint through the District Attorney's Office. The consensus by the panel was that the criminal element would remain on the street, not in jail. For most of the panel, this event offered significant possibilities that went beyond just financial considerations.



### Event 3 – Lawsuit / Jail Incident

High profile incidents draw public scrutiny and often times lawsuits. In today's society, lawsuits are not uncommon. When viewed in terms of jail incidents, lawsuits can produce at least two consequences. The first is the potential for large cash awards to the plaintiff. The second is that the policies and procedures established for the operation of the jail are found to be in need of modification or overhaul. The extent of the impacts would depend upon the conditions existing at the time of the incident. The liability exposure, however, for jail operations is considered to be high.

The view regarding lawsuits and the corresponding impacts on consolidation efforts were mixed. A portion of the panel took the position that a major incident would result in the immediate closure of the local jail facility. Although this was described as a knee jerk reaction, it was the sense by some that it would be the solution implemented. Others considered such an incident as a means or opportunity to explore consolidation efforts for the purposes of maintaining jail operations and reducing liability exposure. As such, the impact of this event was low because of the disparity in viewpoints.

### Event 4 – Legislation Prohibiting Privatization of Jails

An alternative to a public entities operation of a Type I jail facility is to contract the operation out to a private vendor. Currently, there is no specific statute that prohibits a private company from operating a jail facility. There are statutes that restrict or limit the authorized activities of private persons working in a jail facility.

If legislation became law prohibiting private firms from being able to operate jails in the State of California, there could be significant impacts on both current and future jail operations. The panel denoted that such legislation would have a positive effect on the acceptance of

consolidation efforts. In this instance, the panel voted almost unanimously that they believed that such an event would occur within the next ten plus years.

#### Event 5 – Earthquake / Flood / Natural Disaster

The threat of major earthquakes and floods are very real in the southern California area. The destruction from such natural disasters can be substantial in terms of loss of life, injuries and property damage. The view was that should a jail facility fall victim to a natural disaster, there would be some type of needs assessment and analysis conducted prior to reconstruction of the facility. Some factors that would most likely be considered include construction costs, new technologies in conjunction with associated costs, staffing requirements, possible alternative uses for the facilities and expansion potential.

The consensus was that there would be a moderate impact in a positive nature towards exploration of consolidation efforts.

#### Event 6 – Recession

The health of the economy, both nationally and locally, has a direct bearing on the ability of municipalities to provide services to the community they serve. During the good times, the revenues are more likely to be available to pay for the resources necessary for service delivery. In bad economic times, the opposite is true. Limited budgets result in close examination of services provided and the manner in which they are delivered.

Economic conditions were identified as being the most persuasive and compelling in a city council's decision to move towards a consolidation effort in respect to any service or function. As a result of that belief, the panel placed a high positive value on the impact of a recession on this issue.

#### Event 7 – Surplus Revenue Shift to Cities

In contrast to Event 6, the panel examined the possibility that a surplus of funds were returned to the cities. Examples discussed included sales and property tax revenues currently being collected by the state. If a surplus was achieved and it was returned to the cities rather than to the individual taxpayer, what impacts would likely be felt? It was the agreement of the panel that most cities would be much better off financially and would be less likely to consider any changes in services provided or in service delivery.

This event was viewed as having a moderate effect overall on the issue of consolidation and the impact would be a negative one.

#### Event 8 – Negative Media Focus

Initially some comparisons were made between this event and Event 3 – Lawsuit / Jail Incident. After some deliberation, it was concluded that there were sufficient differences between the two that consideration was warranted for both.

Issues agreed to were that the media can and does influence and mold public opinion on a daily basis. If there is an occurrence of a major incident in the jail, the slant of media coverage may have a major impact on the image of a jail and the police department. If the focus of any media coverage is negative, it is conceded that the image of the department will be tarnished to some degree. How that image is then portrayed in a public forum, such as a city council meeting may directly affect the jail operations for that police department. It was perceived that negative attention directed toward a particular jail operation could, in fact, lead to a call for major changes. That call could lead to the opening of the door for a concept such as consolidation.

## Event 9 – Negative Court Decision/Mandate

Non-compliance with court mandates usually results in consequences that involve criminal and/or civil penalties. In most cases, non-compliance is not an option.

As with legislative actions, negative or unfavorable court decisions place heavy burdens on cities regarding the allocation or use of existing resources. This generally translates into additional funding needs that require some adjustments or modifications to the norm of doing business. In the public sector that means cut services or find new ways to deliver them.

The panel believed that there was a strong likelihood that such a court decision or mandate could occur within the next five years and that there would be some positive impact relating to a consolidation effort.

### Cross Impact Analysis

At the conclusion of the facilitated brainstorming session, six members of the original panel were organized to examine whether, and to what degree, each event might impact each trend. Each member provided a numerical number from one to five indicating a low to high value and whether the impact was viewed as being a positive one or a negative one. The cross impact analysis table below represents the combined scores from those members.

Table 5  
Cross Impact Analysis

	<b>Trends</b>									
<b>Events</b>	<b>T-1</b>	<b>T-2</b>	<b>T-3</b>	<b>T-4</b>	<b>T-5</b>	<b>T-6</b>	<b>T-7</b>	<b>T-8</b>	<b>T-9</b>	<b>T-10</b>
<b>E-1</b>	0	+2	+4	0	+4	+1	+3	0	+2	+1
<b>E-2</b>	+3	0	0	+2	+3	+3	-1	0	+4	-1
<b>E-3</b>	+2	+1	+5	+1	+2	+4	0	-2	0	+1
<b>E-4</b>	+2	0	0	+1	+4	+3	+1	+2	+1	0
<b>E-5</b>	0	0	0	+5	+3	+1	0	+1	+4	0
<b>E-6</b>	+4	+1	+1	+5	+4	+3	+3	+2	+5	+3
<b>E-7</b>	-1	0	0	-2	-3	0	-4	0	-1	0
<b>E-8</b>	0	+2	+4	+1	+1	+3	+1	0	+1	+2
<b>E-9</b>	0	+1	+2	0	+2	+3	0	+1	+2	+2

The overview of the cross impact analysis data indicates that the forecast trends that would most likely be impacted by the forecast events are the ones dealing directly with financial implications. A recession (E-6) would have a high probability of impacting construction costs (T-4) and the state of the local economy (T-9). Earthquakes or some other form of natural disaster (E-5) would most likely affect construction costs (T-4). Lawsuits from a jail incident would have a substantial influence on public media scrutiny and community attitudes towards the police department and jail (T-3). These one-time events could impact the forecast trends in a manner that would encourage or support some consideration to the concept of consolidation of jail operations.

On the other hand, if surplus revenues were returned to the cities (E-7) there would be a significant negative impact regarding revenue generation by local government (T-7). It would seem unlikely that if local communities received surplus funds from the state, that they would be justified in creating or even maintaining some form of revenue generation through the delivery of services. Although not an absolute, the panel was of the opinion that constituents of local politicians would require some justification for such policies. That is to say, if municipal government received windfall funds from the state, affected taxpayers would not readily accept local policy to charge user fees for services in order to generate more revenue for local coffers. This would be especially true if there were large reserves in the budget. The panel indicated that some citizens would feel that they were paying for a service twice, once through their taxes and secondly through user fees.

The Nominal Group Technique process produced a number of trends and events that could influence or impact the consolidation of Type I jail operations. Given the various possibilities, three separate scenarios were created to illustrate the pessimistic, optimistic, and normative occurrences based on these same trends and events.

### Future Scenarios

#### Pessimistic

After four years of operation, the Tri-City jail facility was being closed down, permanently. No one would have predicted this outcome, especially considering the optimism exhibited at the onset of the project. The basis for creating the Tri-City Joint Powers Agreement was the need by the cities of York, Cheshire, and Dresden to deal with a continuing problem of booking inmates into a jail facility for up to ninety-six hours prior to arraignment (Type I jail).

The county jail was overcrowded causing delays in acceptance of inmates and even refusals in some instances due to federal mandates. There were also financial considerations. The county had just raised booking fees to \$275.00 per inmate. All three cities had been subject to a declining tax base; revenues were decreasing while expenditures were increasing at a greater rate. The reasoning at the time was that cost effectiveness could be maximized with the theory of economy of scale. If resources, both human and fixed assets, could be joined into one operation, there should be some cost savings to all three cities. The costs would be shared through a formula based on the number of bookings in a one-year period.

After extensive study and evaluation, it was decided to explore the possibility of creating a Joint Powers Authority and consolidating the jail operations of all three cities into one. After a favorable report supporting a Joint Powers Authority (JPA) was presented to all three city councils; an agreement was reached, and the Tri-City Joint Powers Authority was formed in June of 2002. The jail facility in York was expanded and remodeled to meet Title 15 specifications. Civilian jail personnel from all three police agencies were pooled together to staff the new jail facility, with a captain from each agency rotating on a two year basis to act as the manager of the operation. The jail began operations in November of 2002. Cost savings were realized the first two years, although they were meager due to the initial start-up costs.

Problems did not surface until after two years into the agreement. The first sign of trouble was the building of a new county jail only five miles from the Tri-City Jail Facility. Ten months after the new county jail opened, the County Board of Supervisors voted in favor of eliminating all forms of booking fees for all law enforcement agencies located within the county. These two occurrences created a situation in which all three police agencies could now book their respective inmates into the county facility at no cost.

After lengthy debate and discussions, the stakeholders in the JPA voted to dissolve the agreement. The stated reasons were that the location of the new county jail was as convenient as the Tri-City facility. There were no costs or fees associated with the booking of inmates in the county jail, and yet there were rising costs, even though shared, with the JPA. Lastly, there was limited liability exposure to booking inmates into county jail versus the Tri-City jail. It was estimated that once the JPA has been disestablished, the three cities would lose approximately 1.2 million dollars that was initially invested in creating the JPA, including building costs. It will take another five years to break even in savings from not paying the overhead costs that were connected to the Tri-City jail.

Some critics have stated that the three cities overreacted four years ago, when the sheriff and the county were being taken to task in the federal courts for overcrowding problems. No one foresaw voters passing a bond measure to build the new county jail and certainly no one would have predicated that the site chosen to build the new facility would have been in the midst of the tri-city area. What seemed to have been a good idea at the time turned out to be a financial and political boondoggle.

### Optimistic

After five years of operation, members of the Tri-City JPA met to congratulate each other for what has become a very successful business venture. Representatives from the cities of York, Cheshire, and Dresden have reason to celebrate. What started out as a crisis situation has turned into a financial and political success story. Approximately six years ago, the county jail had exceeded maximum capacity in regards to inmate population by fifty-five percent. A federal judge had mandated that no more inmates could be housed in the county facility until some relief plan had been implemented. The county being stretched for funding had increased the booking



fees once again to \$275.00 per inmate. A recent bond measure had just passed that would require a sixty-six and two thirds vote by the populace before any new jails could be built in the county. It was strongly believed that any such attempts to get voter approval for the construction of a new jail would be handily defeated. The cities of York, Cheshire, and Dresden were faced with rising costs in operating their respective Type I jail facilities. Making matters worse, this area of the county had been significantly impacted with the demise of several major clothing and equipment distributors due to the increase of e-commerce sites on the Internet. The result was a decrease in the tax base for the three respective cities. The future looked bleak.

The three chiefs of police and their staffs met to discuss the situation in hopes of finding a solution to their common problems. After reviewing the available options, the decision was made to study the possibility of consolidating the three current jail operations into one. Through the theory of economy of scales, it was believed that the three cities could save money, maintain and control their own jail facility, and improve the quality of service related to the jail operation. Once the feasibility study was completed, a report in support of consolidating the jail operations of the three cities was presented to each of the respective city councils. The political bodies for each city accepted the concept and the Tri-City Jail Joint Powers Authority was established.

The JPA applied for and received a \$500,000.00 grant from the state that was designed specifically for regionalization or consolidation projects. The funds were used to expand and remodel the jail facility at York Police Department. With the modest increase in the number of cells to the York facility, all three cities could comfortably book their inmates into the jail without any fear of overcrowding. In addition to the grant funding received from the state, the three cities realized significant cost savings once the three operations were consolidated into one organization. The total number of jailors between the three agencies was reduced by fifteen

percent thus the total personnel costs were reduced, and the overhead expenses were shared by the three jurisdictions. Because grant funding covered the building costs, the initial start-up costs were minimal after the three agencies provided most of the needed equipment, furniture, and supplies from their existing inventories.

The success of this venture has drawn nationwide attention. As a result, a number of computer vendors and other jail related supply companies have recognized the significance of the consolidation effort. In an attempt to capitalize on the exposure and visibility of the JPA project, they have made the Tri-City jail facility a Beta site for new technology. The benefit to the JPA has been that the entire facility is state-of-art in terms of electronic and computer equipment all at no or reduced costs.

The consolidation effort in this case has been very successful. From a financial perspective, the JPA has been profitable in that all three stakeholders in the JPA are benefiting from some significant cost savings to their budgets. From a political viewpoint, the council members and the chiefs of police for the three jurisdictions are being hailed as progressive and creative leaders.

#### Normative

What began as an experiment in the year 2000 has become business as usual six years later. The Tri-City jail consolidation project was created at the urging of some progressive and insightful law enforcement personnel, as well as some politicians willing to take some risks. The conditions that existed at the time were these:

The county jail was in a critically overcrowded state. The sheriff was under court mandate to restrict the inmate population within the county facilities. In order to comply with this mandate, the sheriff was forced to limit the types of inmates being booked into county jail.

As a result, drunk in public, drunk drivers and low-grade misdemeanor arrests were not being allowed into county jail. Although very unpopular with the county chiefs of police, there was no immediate relief. This was based on the recent passage of a ballot measure that would require a two-thirds voter approval on any future new jail construction. It was strongly believed that no such attempts would be successful. The fact was that with rising construction costs, it was not practical to consider any major building project without some financial aid either through grants or federal subsidies.

The police departments for the three cities of York, Cheshire, and Dresden are medium sized departments. The city jails in York and Cheshire were classified as temporary holding facilities. Because neither jail was able to hold inmates longer than twenty-four hours, the departments were spending an unacceptable amount of time booking and transporting inmates to the county jail. If the inmates fell within the classifications of those not being accepted at the county jail, then the arresting officer generally was obliged to sit by with the inmate until he or she could be released. The two respective chiefs of police were disturbed by the amount of time their patrol officers were spending in support functions in the jail, rather than being in the field performing patrol duties. On the other hand, the Dresden city jail was operated by a private vendor, Acme Jail Inc. The concern faced by the city of Dresden was the recent legislation signed into law prohibiting private contracting of jail services in the state. The Dresden Chief of Police, found himself with a thirty-bed jail and no one to staff or manage it.

The city of York had just been ordered to pay a significant judgment as a result of a lawsuit filed by the relatives of an inmate who had committed suicide by hanging himself while in a temporary holding cell. The media coverage of this event was significant and resulted in

several public hearings by the York City Council. The result was a commitment by the city council to review alternative jail operation formats.

The economy throughout the nation was healthy. There were growing concerns however, that the local tax base for many communities was being threatened by the rapid growth of e-commerce. This impact was in fact being felt by the three cities of York, Cheshire, and Dresden. Although in the year 2000, the budgets were balanced and revenues were greater than expenditures, it was forecasted that the trend would be reversed within two years. The two largest employee unions in the cities of York and Dresden had just settled salary negotiations; both contracts involved sizable pay increases. In addition, the benefit packages for both cities included the Public Employee Retirement System three percent at fifty retirement plan. Both of these factors were going to have eventual impacts on the budgets for the two cities.

With all of these considerations, the police chiefs from the three cities met to discuss possible alternatives to their operations. After some consideration, it was decided to conduct a feasibility study into the possibility of consolidating jail operations into one. The criteria that had to be achieved was that the venture would have to be financially worthwhile; the quality of service would have to be maintained at current levels or better; there could be no creation of a new bureaucracy; support functions such as personnel, finance, and legal would have to be shared amongst the three cities; and all costs would have to be shared on a formula basis. The study reflected that such a project could meet or exceed all established criteria, if the stakeholders worked together as partners.

The city councils reviewed and accepted the feasibility study and entered into a Joint Powers Agreement to create the Tri-City jail. The Board of Directors for the JPA was comprised of one city council member from each jurisdiction. An Administrative Oversight Committee

(AOC) was comprised of the three city managers and the three police chiefs. These two aforementioned groups established policy and guidance for the Agency. The day-to-day management staff for the jail was formed, by rotating a captain from each of the three police agencies on a two-year cycle. The remainder of the jail staff was made up of former jail staff personnel from the three agencies. They became permanent employees of the JPA.

All support duties, tasks, and responsibilities were shared amongst the three cities. The city of York housed the facility and was therefore responsible for all utility and maintenance costs. The city of Cheshire managed all of the personnel and finance department responsibilities while the city of Dresden was tasked with handling all legal issues and matters through their City Attorney's Office. At the conclusion of each year, an audit was conducted to determine if there were any unbalanced expenditures associated with any of the support roles. If so, they were to be reconciled by the Board of Directors. To date, no such instances had occurred. The budget was based on a formula that split the costs among the three cities. The formula was established on the basis of the number of inmates booked on average over a five-year period of time. The formula would be re-evaluated every five years.

The Tri-City jail has afforded the three cities with a quality Type I jail facility that meets or exceeds the needs of the three police departments. When the facility was built, it was equipped with state-of-the-art computers and electronics for surveillance and operational functions. This factor has allowed the facility to operate without an increase in personnel. The financing for the equipment was through grant funding. The operation of the Tri-City jail has allowed arresting officers to respond to the jail and then return to the field in half the time than when utilizing the county jail. Because of the economy of scales, the cost for jail services for

each of the three cities decreased by a modest twenty-five percent to thirty percent. Overall, the Tri-City jail has been mildly successful.

The objective for the futures study was to provide some analysis regarding the trends and events that have the potential to impact the success or failure of a consolidation effort on Type I jail operations. As was demonstrated in the cross impact analysis, the factors most likely to influence or impact a consolidation effort are those involving financial concerns. This was further illustrated in the three scenarios in which the achievement levels of consolidation efforts varied from failure to highly successful. In order to realize the desired scenario, a strategic plan must be established that will transition the organizations in question, from current day positions to futuristic ones that are conducive to consolidation endeavors.

## SECTION THREE

### A STRATEGY FOR THE FUTURE

Each of the scenarios in Section Two portrayed potential future outcomes that could be faced by three medium sized police agencies undertaking a jail consolidation project within the next five to six years. The third or normative scenario is the one that is most likely to occur. Based on that scenario, a strategic plan will be developed and presented providing a means of transition for organizations desiring to implement consolidation principles for their respective jail operations. The presentation will include the current environment and conditions for three medium sized police agencies; an analysis of the Strengths and Weaknesses, Opportunities and Threats (SWOT) being faced by the three agencies; an assessment of stakeholders; and a synopsis of possible strategies that would benefit the successful implementation of consolidation of Type I jail operations.

#### The Current Environment

In the three previous scenarios, the cities of York, Cheshire, and Dresden were used as hypothetical examples. The three cities actually represent the model cities of Cypress, Los Alamitos and Seal Beach respectfully from Section One of this paper. As such, they will be used as the models in this discussion.

The current circumstances, as they relate to the three city jails, are as follows. The York Police Department operates a Temporary Holding facility. Due to financial and staffing concerns, the York Police Department chose to downgrade from a Type I jail to a Temporary Holding facility in 1999. There are currently eight beds and two booking cells within the facility. There are five full-time staff members who work in the jail. When jailers are unavailable, police officers perform the booking and transporting duties. The Cheshire Police

Department operates a Temporary Holding facility. There are two holding cells within the facility. There are no staff members assigned to jail duties. Booking and transportation responsibilities belong to the police officers. The Dresden Police Department contracts a 30 bed facility that is staffed twenty-four hours a day, seven days a week by private citizen employees. The contract vendor is Acme Jail Inc. An Acme Jail Inc. employee books any inmate arrested by an officer of the Dresden Police Department. If an inmate needs to be transported to the county jail or to court, the Acme Jail Inc. employee handles that duty.

The current political climate is that pending legislation will soon be considered that would prohibit private contracting of jail services in the State of California. If this event were to occur, any local jail in the state currently being managed by a private vendor would have to significantly alter its operations.

### SWOT Analysis

A SWOT analysis is intended to identify and assess the strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, and threats that could impact the strategic plan. The analysis for the consolidation of jail operations for the three jurisdictions is as follows.

#### Strengths

- The facilities needed to accommodate a consolidation effort exist.
- The three police departments share a common Records Management System through a computer network system.
- The three police departments share a common Computer Aided Dispatch system.
- The three agencies are currently participating partners in a successful Joint Powers Authority venture with West Cities Communications Center Joint Powers Authority.
- The three jurisdictions are in close proximity to each other.



- The three police departments are progressive and innovative in their approaches to law enforcement.
- Costs to operate the jail could be shared.

#### Weaknesses

- City of Dresden would lose approximately \$120,000.00 in contract revenues with the loss of the contract with Acme Jail Inc. With pending legislation regarding private vendors, the loss may be inevitable.
- Each agency would give up some management control over jail operations.
- Both of the Joint Powers Authority ventures, West-Comm and the jail, would be located at the Dresden Police Department. Perception would be that Dresden is taking over police services for other two jurisdictions.

#### Opportunities

- All three agencies would have access to a Type I jail facility within close distance to police departments.
- New technology could have impact on jail applications.
- Federal and state grant opportunities related to shared or consolidated effort programs by multiple agencies. Such funding could offset initial start-up costs.
- Revenue programs for the jail could be examined – pay for stay or per diem fees could be charged for inmates from other jurisdictions.
- Cost savings could be realized with a properly structure JPA.

## Threats

- The make up of the city councils for the three cities changes every two years. There could be a shift away from the philosophy to share support services when possible.
- For the cities of York and Cheshire, citizen groups feeling that the city is giving away a portion of the police departments with a move of the jail facilities to Dresden.
- Competition from other law enforcement agencies for available grant funding.
- Pressure from Dresden City Council to find a means to recuperate the lost revenue from the private contractor.
- Backlash from the county due to the discontinued or reduced usage of county jail facility. This would represent a potential loss of revenue to the county.

## Stakeholder Analysis

Stakeholders are individuals, groups or organizations who have a vested interest in the outcome of a future scenario and who have the ability and means to obstruct or move us to the attainment of our goals and objectives for that scenario. In this case, the identified stakeholders may actively oppose the idea of consolidating the jail operations or they may be ones who support it and make it happen.

The stakeholders for this project are identified as follows.

Internal	External
Chief of Police York	City Council for York
Chief of Police Cheshire	City Council for Cheshire
Chief of Police Dresden	City Council for Dresden

Police Officer Association for York P. D.	City Manager for York
Police Officer Association for Cheshire P.D.	City Manger for Cheshire
Police Officer Association for Dresden P.D.	City Manager for Dresden
	Finance Department York
	Finance Department Cheshire
	Finance Department Dresden
	Citizens of York, Cheshire, and Dresden
	County Sheriff
	County Board of Supervisors

From the perspective of internal stakeholders, the three police chiefs would need to embrace the notion of consolidation within the police organizations. This is of the utmost importance to instill confidence and support to line level personnel. They would also need to voice their support for the project in public forums when possible. Members of the community will look to the chief executives of the three agencies for guidance and direction regarding the intent of their support. If the chiefs appear to be dragging their feet or hesitant regarding the move towards consolidation, others will follow.

The three Police Officer Associations (POA's) would not appear to be major players in this move. However, they should not be dismissed. If there is the perception that the departments are being broken up piecemeal, the fear of a total merger of the three departments could be interpreted as being the ultimate goal. This perception would most likely generate some degree of negative energy towards any further efforts to consolidate services or functions within the agencies. The POA's position on the matter, in terms of support or opposition, could directly influence members of the community.

From the external stakeholders perspective, the members of the three city councils are the key components in the success or failure of any efforts towards consolidation. Without their direct support and action, the consolidation effort will not occur. Some members of the councils may view this move as furtherance in efforts to find cost saving measures. Others may see it as a step towards building a new bureaucracy that becomes laborious and difficult to control and manage. In any regards, the critical factor that the city councils will consider is the financial one. If the cost savings are there, the support may be there. If the financial benefits are minimal or non-existent, there is very little hope that there will be any support for the project.

The three city managers have a critical role in regards to this effort. On one hand, they may be resistive to the thought of giving up a portion of the police department's organization. On the other, they may recognize the potential for cost savings that would be critical to the overall financial condition for the city. Because there is a likelihood that other city departments will be involved in the support of a consolidation effort, the city managers will need to promote a cooperative atmosphere among other department heads to ensure positive results.

The finance departments will have a support role in a consolidation effort and will need to provide sound advice to the city managers and city councils. If the approach is to find reasons to either proceed or not to proceed with a consolidation effort, the numbers could be used to influence the decision makers. The financial factors will be the driving force behind any effort to consolidate.

The citizens of the three communities will have a voice in this matter. For the communities of York and Cheshire, there may be relief that inmates are no longer being housed, even for short durations, within their cities. There would be no direct service delivery impacts on the average citizen of any of the three communities. Unlike other services provided by the

police department, jail services is not one in which the average citizen expects to ever have to utilize. Their support or opposition will be based on the impacts that this outcome will have related to the city budget. Will it cost more or less to operate a consolidated jail? If taxes are going to go up, the opposition will increase; if taxes or costs to the citizens goes down, then support will likely increase.

The relationship between municipalities and their respective counties is often times a tenuous one. There is competition for political control, power, and funding. It should come as no surprise then, that with a jail consolidation effort between two or more agencies, there would be an impact on the county jail facility and operation. The impact, depending on the totality of circumstances could be either positive or negative. If, for instance, the county jail were in an overcrowded state, such a consolidation effort might provide the county an opportunity for some relief, if the facilities were able to accommodate additional inmates. If, on the other hand, the county jail were not in an overcrowded condition and relied on jail booking fees as needed revenue, such a consolidation effort could result in a negative impact to the county.

Acknowledging that the county sheriff and the county board of supervisors would be afforded limited influence on a decision of whether or not to consolidate jail operations, both entities nonetheless, should be considered as stakeholders. As illustrated above, there are very real impacts to the county as a result of a consolidation effort. Consideration may be warranted in regards to allowing the county officials an opportunity to provide their input prior to the finalization of any implementation plan.

### Strategy Development

Reflecting on the current environment, the SWOT analysis, and the stakeholder analysis, the subsequent strategic plan was developed for purposes of achieving the future outcome of consolidating jail services for the three agencies.

1. Continue the dialogue between the three agencies regarding the benefits and obstacles related to the consolidation of police services. This would be accomplished through the already existent Administrative Oversight Committee.
2. Actively cultivate community support through informational enrichment programs. By educating key citizens, i.e., business leaders, service club representatives, and citizen groups, an influential support group can be developed to provide community backing.
3. Promote open lines of communication that are responsive to organizational change.

Because most people assess change on a personal level, the organization must “create a sense of participation in the change effort.”<sup>21</sup>

It is important to point out that whatever strategic plan is developed for purposes of implementation regarding the consolidation of jail operations, the critical component will be the people selected to develop, enhance and execute that plan. As in most significant endeavors, the stakeholders hold the keys to success or failure. As an organization or in this instance, three organizations, it behooves the leadership to involve proponent and opponent alike in the early feasibility and planning discussions. Future scenario outcomes in regards to a consolidation effort may depend upon this initial input.

## SECTION FOUR

### TRANSITION MANAGEMENT

With the key stakeholders identified and the strategies developed for the desired futures scenario, the next step is to formulate the transition process by which the implementation may occur. This process will involve identifying those stakeholders who are most likely to bring about the successful implementation of the proposed strategies. These persons or groups individually may or may not have sufficient influence to sway the outcome of the future scenario. However, together they represent the critical mass that would ensure the success of the project. Without their support, there is little likelihood that achievement of the goals and objectives could be realized.

For this project, the critical stakeholders include the members of the three city councils, the three city managers, and the three police of chiefs. Each group will be discussed in terms of the importance of their involvement.

#### Stakeholders

##### City Councils

In order for a Type I jail consolidation effort between jurisdictions to be successful, there must be a concurrence to participate between the contributing members. The contract between the agencies would be in the form of a Joint Powers Agreement. That agreement in this situation could only be authorized by the three city councils. Without the support of each of the three city councils, the futures scenario presented in this paper could not and would not happen. If any of

the City Councils choose not to participate, the structure of the consolidation would be impacted to the possible point of failure.

### City Managers

The city managers are the chief executives for the cities. Their support for the consolidation effort is essential for two reasons. The first, they have the most direct contact with the city council members. The city manager's recommendations will most assuredly have the greatest influence on the city councils on matters relating to financial concerns or issues. If in fact, financial considerations will be the driving force to move a consolidation effort forward, then the comments and advice of the city manager will be vital. Secondly, the city managers would have the responsibility to ensure that the consolidation project was properly implemented.

### Police Chiefs

The chief of police is the chief executive for the police department. He or she has the most direct interaction with the city manager. The police chiefs are responsible for the oversight of the police department. They are responsible for establishing goals and objectives, organizational philosophy, and departmental policy. Although not in a position to make the consolidation effort happen alone, the chief of police is in the position that his support or resistance to such an effort would have considerable impact.

### Transition Plan

The transition will begin at the lowest level of critical mass, which in this case involves the three chiefs of police. Their efforts begin with the open lines of communication within the respective police agencies. A consolidation project of this magnitude represents change on a large scale. It will impact not only patrol officers, but also support staff such as records



personnel. Therefore, a committee comprised of a cross section of the workforce from the three agencies could examine the consolidation project from an achievability perspective. The emphasis would be on the impacts, positive and negative, affecting the various disciplines within the organizations. It would be prudent to include management representatives from other city departments, i.e., human resource and finance departments that may be impacted by a consolidation effort. Depending upon the structure of the Joint Powers Authority, these departments could be tasked with added duties and responsibilities related to the consolidation.

Through a process of problem solving, the weaknesses or shortfalls to the project could be identified and examined for possible resolution. This instills with line level personnel the feeling of interactive participation in the development of the consolidation effort and it allows for the naysayers to give their input during the initial phase of the process. Based on the preliminary analysis from the appointed staff committees, a blue print for implementation could be fashioned in outline form.

Most managers working in law enforcement environments would probably agree that managing significant change within their agencies is challenging. In this situation, the test is three-fold. The change involved in the consolidation effort impacts three diverse departments. How the change impacts the three agencies may or may not be similar. What is consistent is the fact that the three organizations will need to work in a collaborative effort to develop the consolidation structure and then work collectively once the consolidation is implemented. The importance of honest and sincere communication, not only within each organization but also among the three agencies, cannot be overstated.

The facilitation for this dialogue between the three agencies could be accomplished through the Administrative Oversight Committee that is currently in place with West-Comm.

The Administrative Oversight Committee is made up of the three city managers and the three chief of police. Under normal circumstances, this group is responsible for the administration and management of the communications center, West-Comm. In this forum, they would provide direction and oversight into the discussions regarding consolidation efforts with the city councils. Through special workshops, the Administrative Oversight Committee could inform, educate, and brief members of the city councils on the trends and events affecting jail operations both locally and statewide.

Community support is important for two reasons. The first is that effective police agencies cultivate and maintain positive partnerships with the communities that they serve. This affiliation between the department and citizens creates an atmosphere of trust, confidence, and reliance on one other. The payoff for this sense of comradeship is when the police department is before the city council making its case on an issue and needs the persuasive power of a supportive voice. Secondly, community support is important because it acts like a conduit for ideas and information that enhances the department's ability to develop meaningful strategies and programs for the future. Informing and educating the public through vigorous interaction with the business community, service clubs and citizen academy programs can transmit the department's mission and goals throughout the community. In return, the feedback received from these public contacts provides valuable insight into the opinions and attitudes of the community. The result is both parties benefit.

#### Transition Management Structure

The transition for a consolidation project of this nature requires extraordinary leadership skills and talents. For that reason, there needs to be some discussion regarding the management structure for this undertaking. Rule by committee will work when dealing with issues in terms of

general context. However, when attempting to make decisions or direct activities of a narrow focus, there should be one person in charge who is accountable. It is suggested for this project that the following management template be considered.

The city council members are the policy makers. Their role will be to evaluate that final proposal and to make the decision as to whether or not to participate. They also are responsible for allocating any funding that may be required to initiate the consolidation. Most likely, one member from each city council will be selected to sit as a Board of Director for the new agency or at least in an advisory capacity, depending upon the Joint Powers Authority structure. The city councils will not be involved in day-to-day activities or decisions.

The city managers and chiefs of police comprise the Administrative Oversight Committee. One of the critical tasks of this committee is to communicate the vision of the consolidation effort to both the city councils and to the personnel from each of the three agencies. The secondary mission for this committee is to manage and direct the drafting of the blue prints for the transition to a functioning consolidated jail operation. There are two means of accomplishing this task. One is by seeking outside assistance through consultants. This would of course cost money, which may or may not be available. The second way is to use city personnel. Staff from each of the participating jurisdictions could be formed into an Operations Committee and given responsibility for specific assignments in respect to creating a budget, establishing personnel rules and regulations, drafting policy and procedure manuals and miscellaneous materials. In this case, the Administrative Oversight Committee should appoint a management person from one of the three agencies to act a project manager and chairperson for the Operations Committee. The project manager would report directly to the Administrative Oversight Committee. This arrangement allows for the Administrative Oversight Committee to

establish the general course for the project and the project manager the ability to establish the distinct bearings for the operations committee.

Leadership is critical to the project. The Administrative Oversight Committee has the pivotal responsibility of keeping the line level personnel focused and motivated to proceed with the change at hand and the task of influencing members of the city councils towards a desired future. In the pursuit of change, especially at this level, comes an element of risk taking. Competent leadership does not shy away from taking calculated risks, but embraces the prospects provided by the opportunities. This is certainly the case with a consolidation project involving jail operations at a local level. Risks are involved, as are monetary commitments; however weighed against the possibilities and opportunities for cost savings and increased service levels, a favorable future can be realized.

In summary, effective leaders analyze current situations, forecast future trends and events, plan for future eventualities, communicate desired futures with stakeholders and benefactors, and take the necessary risks to make the change happen.

## SECTION FIVE

### CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This project studied the possible impacts that consolidating Type I jail operations would have on medium sized police agencies by the year 2006. The conclusions arrived at from this project are based on three outlooks. The first hypothesis is that as we progress into the 21<sup>st</sup> Century, the demands on the statewide jail system will increase. There has been no indication that there will be a significant movement towards building any new jail or detention facilities soon. If the trend relating to the number of inmates booked per month begins to increase and no relief has been sought regarding the available bed space, there will be a crisis at hand. This project discussed that some of the solutions to jail overcrowding include pretrial releases, early releases of sentenced inmates and alternatives to incarceration programs. Although some of these choices are appropriate in certain cases, it should not be assumed that any one of them would be a favored preference over incarceration.

The second hypothesis is that the operation of a Type I jail facility for a small to medium sized police agency is very costly. This suggestion is based on interviews with city managers, chiefs of police, and finance directors. These expenditures are generated through personnel costs, liability insurance, supply and equipment needs, and maintenance of the facilities. The two most expensive are personnel costs and liability insurance. Appropriate staffing levels for Type I jail facilities is crucial in terms of meeting the requirements of Title 15 and Title 24 of the California Code of Regulations and with respect to liability exposure. Personnel costs for jail staff would include salaries, benefits and training requirements. The minimum staffing levels would be dependent upon the needs of the agency. The fact remains, that the majority of the jail budget will be dedicated to personnel costs. The other major expense is liability insurance.

Premiums can vary from region to region and agency-to-agency, depending upon the nature of the jail operation and upon any significant claims filed against the agency. They can range from thousands to hundreds of thousands of dollars.

The third hypothesis is that most medium sized police agencies need access to Type I jail facilities. The demand is based on the activity of the department in regards to the number of arrests made per month. Obviously, the more proactive a department is in respect to enforcement proceedings the greater the need for a jail facility. In this regard, the concern becomes, does the agency have its own Type I jail facility or use an off-site facility. This could be a county jail or a neighboring agency's jail. Factors to consider are the driving distance to that jail, how much time does an officer spend transporting and booking an inmate at an off-site location, and if there are booking or contract fees attached to the use of the facility. These factors have cost implications associated with them. The bottom line becomes how medium sized police agencies will address their respective needs for jail services.

For some agencies, the desire or ability to operate a Type I jail is not there. They have elected to seek alternatives to the stand-alone operation. The options include using the county jail, contracting with another agency, or to contract with a private vendor to operate the jail. Discussions in this paper outlined the various advantages and disadvantages regarding each alternative. Chief executives for each agency must analyze their respective situations in terms of needs and resources. The solution for one agency may not be acceptable or practical for another. What the data has indicated, however, is that not many police departments in the State of California have opted to outsource through public contracts their jail services or to contract them through private vendors. If increases in booking or contract fees become unacceptable, then what other options exist?

An alternative that has not been explored or implemented to date is the consolidation of Type I jail operations between two or more agencies. A consolidation effort represents a method in which each participating department maintains a percentage of ownership in the jail operation. They share control, costs, liabilities, and services. The consolidation approach exploits the economy of scale principle, while reducing overall costs to the stakeholders. Consolidation methodologies allow for more direct control over costs and operational decision-making. The merits of consolidating jail operations are worth examination.

The outcomes then for consolidating Type I jail operations could mean significant cost savings to each of the agencies participating in the unification effort. Unlike contracting or privatization, each agency maintains some share of administrative control over the operation of the jail. In regards to the liability and funding facets of consolidating the jail function, each agency would be responsible for a designated percentage of the overall costs. Depending upon the terms of the Joint Powers Agreement, each agency would certainly have less financial accountability than currently exists independent of each other. The employees of the Joint Powers Authority would be classified as public employees and would therefore, be empowered by statute to work in the jail. Lastly, with direct supervision and oversight of the jail function, quality control and service levels should not be lessened for any of the stakeholders.

With the focus of this project on the aspect of futures research, it is important then to consider what impacts future trends and events could have on consolidation efforts. Through the Nominal Group Technique process, a panel brainstormed and discussed a number of trends and events that they believed could have impacts on such an effort. The lists were narrowed down and issues were debated individually. Such trends as restrictive judicial mandates, slumping local economies, and increased demand for consolidation or regionalization of government

services would greatly impact the desirability to consolidate jail operations. Also, the occurrence of such events as reinstitution or increase in jail booking fees, legislative mandates prohibiting privatization of jail operations or a recession would equally have a significant impact on the motivation to consolidate. It was the consensus of the panel that the principal certainty that would hasten a move towards consolidation, would most likely involve financial concerns.

The processes by which organizations move from their current environments to desired futures, involves the development and implementation of effective strategic and transitional plans. These plans become the organizational blue print for change. In the early stages of the planning process, the critical mass must be identified. These are the key stakeholders, who individually or collectively have the ability and means to either obstruct the move towards the desired future or to make it happen. In this instance, the critical mass would involve the top leadership of the participating cities and police departments. The members of the city councils would certainly be in a position to either move the project forward or to terminate it. Without their combined majority, the consolidation does not exist.

The leadership roles by the city managers and chiefs of police cannot be underestimated. The complexity of structuring a consolidation organization that meets the needs of all of the participants is not an easy feat. There must be unity in the vision, in the mission, and in the goals and objectives. This accord must be communicated within each agency individually and among all of the agencies collectively. Because there is a natural reaction to resist change by organizations, the leadership must encourage innovation and new ideas. The leadership must demonstrate a commitment to making changes that will influence and impact the future of their organizations. Finally, they must be willing to commit the resources to ensure that implementation is achieved effectively and efficiently.



Of equal importance is the relationship between the police and the community. Those partnerships forged on trust and confidence will yield valuable support and encouragement. Politics is a way of life, a fact that law enforcement executives must readily accept. Having the ability to call upon key individuals and/or groups within the community to back a cause is indispensable. This rapport will be enhanced through open and honest communication. Citizen input and participation should be encouraged and cultivated.

As leaders in law enforcement, we are charged with the responsibility to move our organizations into the future. This can be done by being reactive to events as they occur or by being proactive and forecasting trends and events of the future. The proactive choice allows for planning and preparation for the possibilities of future outcomes. This increases the chances of being in the right spot at the right time. In terms of this project, those principles have been applied to the concept of consolidating Type I jail operations for the medium sized police agency by the year 2006. Although not viewed as the cure all or final solution to an agency's jail woes, the prospect of consolidating jail services does offer opportunities and benefits that have heretofore not been explored.

## APPENDIX A

### Nominal Group Technique Panel

- |                      |  |
|----------------------|--|
| 1. Mr. David Birozy  | Lieutenant, Cypress Police Department          |
| 2. Mr. Walter Bowman | Real Estate Broker                             |
| 3. Mr. Bob Dominguez | City Manager, City of Los Alamitos             |
| 4. Mr. Tim Keenan    | City Councilman, City of Cypress               |
| 5. Mr. Steve Kelch   | Sergeant, Orange County Sheriffs Department    |
| 6. Mr. Mike McCrary  | Chief of Police, City of Los Alamitos          |
| 7. Ms. June Liu      | Assistant to the City Manager, City of Cypress |
| 8. Mr. Bill O'Connor | California Board of Corrections                |
| 9. Mr. Jim Phillips  | College Professor, Economist                   |

### Assistants to the Facilitation

- |                      |                                       |
|----------------------|---------------------------------------|
| 1. Mr. John Schaefer | Captain, Seal Beach Police Department |
| 2. Ms. Mary Weuve    | Secretary, Cypress Police Department  |

## APPENDIX B

### NGT: TRENDS BRAINSTORMING LIST

1. Cost of Officers in Relation to Booking and Transportation
2. Cultural Diversity
3. Community Attitudes Developed through Media Scrutiny
4. Construction Costs
5. Regionalization of Government Services
6. Judicial Mandates
7. Need for Revenue Generation by Government
8. Use of Technology as Alternatives to Incarceration
9. Gap between Revenues and Costs of Local Government
10. Success of Community Oriented Policing Approaches
11. Employment Impact on Staffing
12. Transit Time from Municipal Jail to County Jail
13. Juvenile/Aging Population
14. Strength of Economy
15. Gap Between Haves and Have Not's
16. Budget Surplus
17. Grants Specifically For Regional Jails
18. Public Outcry Ballot Measures – Not In My Backyard (NIMBy)
19. Jail Expansion
20. Usage of Local Jails

## APPENDIX B - Continued

21. Booking Fees
22. Local Detention Facilities Reduces Crime
23. Public Attitudes Towards Arrests versus Alternatives to Incarceration Programs
24. Legalization of Drugs
25. Respect for Law/Authority
26. Gun Control
27. Legalized Gambling
28. Hi-Tech Internet Crimes
29. Juveniles Prosecuted as Adults
30. Issues Related to Intoxicated Individuals
31. Social Changes- “Me Generation”
32. Alternative Sentencing Technology
33. COP/POP (Quality of Life vs. Criminal Issues)

## APPENDIX C

### NGT: EVENTS BRAINSTORMIN LIST

1. Election/Change of Leadership
2. Re-institute/Increase Booking Fees
3. Lawsuit/Jail Incident
4. Legislation Prohibiting Privatization of Jails
5. Earthquake/Flood/Natural Disaster
6. Recession
7. Revenue Shift to Cities
8. Negative Media focus
9. Negative Court Decision Mandate
10. Ballot Measure Requiring 2/3 Vote To Build New Jail
11. Major Census Shift
12. Job Action
13. County Bankruptcy
14. Administrative Conflicts Between County and Cities
15. Military Base Closures
16. Grant Funding Award For Jail Construction
17. Live Scan is Implemented
18. Major Airport is Constructed in Area
19. Stock Market Crashes
20. Stock Market Doubles

## APPENDIX C - continued

- 21. County Builds New Jail Facility
- 22. New Technology Allows For Off-Site Arraignments
- 23. Loss of Asset Forfeiture Funding
- 24. Increase in Required Annual Training For Correctional Officers/Jailers
- 25. Racial Profiling Mandated

## ENDNOTES

- 
- <sup>1</sup> Mark Ochendusko, City Manager, City of Coronado, Former City Manager of City of Cypress. June 25, 1997, Interview
- <sup>2</sup> California Board of Corrections, Jail Survey Profile 1999, Executive Summary
- <sup>3</sup> U.S. Department of Justice, Federal Bureau of Investigation, Crime in the United States, 1995,1996,1997,1998,1999, Index of Crime by Region
- <sup>4</sup> California Board of Corrections, Jail Profile Survey 1999, Perspective
- <sup>5</sup> California Board of Corrections, Jail Profile Survey 1999, Perspective
- <sup>6</sup> California Board of Corrections, Jail Profile Survey 1999, Executive Summary
- <sup>7</sup> Police Services Study, City of Cypress, Organizational Effectiveness Consulting, March 1999, p. 26
- <sup>8</sup> Douglas A. Holien, Field Representative, California Board of Corrections, Issues Paper: Privately Operated Jails, March 1997, p.8
- <sup>9</sup> California Code of Regulations, Title 15, Section 1006(hh), p. 4
- <sup>10</sup> Robert A. Krauss, Police Captain, City of Cypress, November 4, 2000, Interview
- <sup>11</sup> Mike McCrary, Chief of Police, City of Los Alamitos, November 22, 2000, Interview
- <sup>12</sup> Mike Sellers, Chief of Police, City of Seal Beach, November 21, 2000, Interview
- <sup>13</sup> Bill O'Connor, Field Representative, California Board of Corrections, September 20, 2000, Interview
- <sup>14</sup> Charles H. Logan, Private Prisons: Cons and Pros, New York, Oxford University Press, 1990, pp. 41-48
- <sup>15</sup> Charles H. Logan, Private Prisons: Cons and Pros, New York, Oxford University Press, 1990, pp. 41-48
- <sup>16</sup> Douglas A. Holien, Field Representative, California Board of Corrections, Issues Paper: Privately Operated Jails, March 1997, pp 4-5
- <sup>17</sup> Mark Ochendusko, City Manager, City of Coronado, Former City Manager City of Cypress, June 25, 1997, Interview

---

<sup>18</sup> Webster's II New College Dictionary (1999), s.v. "Consolidation"

<sup>19</sup> Bill O'Connor, Field Representative, California Board of Corrections, September 20, 2000, Interview

<sup>20</sup> Mike McCrary, Chief of Police, City of Los Alamitos, November 22, 2000, Interview

<sup>21</sup> Lewis Partners, Consultants, CHANGE, handout, 213 13<sup>th</sup> St., Seal Beach, California 90740



---

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Ammons, David N. and Debra J. Hill. "The Viability of Public-Private Competition as a Long Term Service Delivery Strategy." *Public Productivity and Management Review* (Vol 19, 1995): 12-24.
- Birzer, Michael L. "Police Supervision in the 21<sup>st</sup> Century," *FBI Law Enforcement Bulletin* (June 1996): 1.
- California Board of Corrections. *Jail Profile Survey: Executive Summary* (1999).
- California Board of Corrections. *Jail Profile Survey: Perspective* (1999).
- California Code of Regulations. Title 15.
- California Code of Regulations. Title 24.
- Holien, Douglas A. California Board of Corrections. *Privately Operated Jails* (March 1997).
- Krauss, Robert A. Captain. Cypress Police Department. Interview by author, November 4, 2000.
- Logan, Charles H. *Private Prisons: Cons and Pros*. New York: Oxford Press, 1990.
- McCrary, Michael. Chief of Police. Los Alamitos Police Department. Interview by author, November 22, 2000.
- National Institute of Corrections Information Center. Briefing Paper: *Regional Jails*. January 1992.
- National Institute of Corrections Information Center. Briefing Paper: *Trends in Jail Privatization*. February 1992.
- National League of Cities. *Privatization: Contracting Local Government Services*. Washington D.C., National League of Cities. 1993.
- O'Connor, Bill. Field Representative. California Board of Corrections. Interviews by author, September 20, 2000 and November 10, 2000.
- O'Connor, Bill, Field Representative, California Board of Corrections. Telephone Interview by author, December 5, 2000.

---

Ochendusko, Mark. City Manager. City of Cypress. Interview by author, June 25, 1997.  
BIBLIOGRAPHY (continued)

Ohio Department of Rehabilitation and Correction. Regionalization of Corrections: Viable Option for Growth Management, or Dilution of Control? *Association of State Correctional Administrators newsletter*. May 1991.

Organizational Effectiveness Consulting, *Police Services Study Prepared for the City of Cypress*. March 1999.

POST Command College, "Providing Cooperative Police Services in Northwest Orange County in 2009." Prepared by John Schaefer. September 1999.

Rubenstein, Moshe. POST Command College, Class 30, Session #2, February 23, 2000, San Marcos, California.

Rubenstein, Moshe F. and Iris R. Firstenberg. *The Minding Organization*, New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 1999.

Sellers, Michael, Chief of Police. Seal Beach Police Department, Interview by author, November 21, 2000.

Storey, Richard, Finance Director. City of Cypress. Interview by author, November 7, 2000.

U.S. Federal Bureau of Investigation, Department of Justice, *Crime in the United States 1999* Washington D.C.: Government Printing Office, 2000. Index of Crime by Region.

U. S. Federal Bureau of Investigation, Department of Justice, *Crime in the United States 1998* Washington D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1999. Index of Crime by Region.

U. S. Federal Bureau of Investigation, Department of Justice, *Crime in the United States 1997* Washington D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1998. Index of Crime by Region.

U. S. Federal Bureau of Investigation, Department of Justice, *Crime in the United States 1996* Washington D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1997. Index of Crime by Region.

U. S. Federal Bureau of Investigation, Department of Justice, *Crime in the United States 1995* Washington D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1996. Index of Crime by Region.

---